Remarks

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. The specification has been amended. Claims 1-5 have been deleted. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the features "the first end. . .second connectors" in claim 1, lines 12-20, were not disclosed in the specification.

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled from the application. The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, therefore, is moot.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that in claim 1, lines 7-11, it is unclear how the first engaging part which electrically connects to the first shield and the second engaging part which electrically connects to the second shield could provide a locking and electrical engagement therebetween.

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled from the application. The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, therefore, is moot.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeomans et al. (US Patent No. 6,431,887 B1).

The Examiner stated that Yeomans et al. teaches a first connector 10 and a second connector 50, 60. The first connector 10 has a first insulating housing 16, first contacts 24, and a first shielding shell 12, 14. The second connector 50, 60 has a second insulating housing 60, second contacts 64, and a second shielding shell 50. The first connector 10 has a latching arm 18 and a first engaging part 139. The second connector 50, 60 has a second engaging part 102 and spring contacts 90, 92, 94. The Examiner further stated that in absence of any showing of criticality by the Applicant to arrange the first and second contact parts perpendicular to the mating direction with a disposed spacing relative to each other along the direction perpendicular to the mating direction, that it would have been an obvious modification to do so since the changes solve no stated problem. It also would have been obvious to replace the projection of the first engaging part 139 with a hole and replace the hole of the second engaging part 102 with a projection. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Yeomans et al. teaches or suggests all of the elements of claims 1-5.

Claims 1-5 have been cancelled from the application. The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), therefore, is moot.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeomans et al. (US Patent No. 6,431,887 B1).

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner stated that Yeomans et al. teaches an electrical connector having an insulating housing 10 that holds contacts 24. A shielding shell 12, 14 is mounted on the insulating housing 16. A metal latching arm 18 having a front end 144, 152 is

fastened to an end of the shielding shell 12, 14. The metal latching arm 18 has a rear end 132 and an engaging part 139 that cooperates with a mating engaging part of a mating connector. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Yeomans et al. teaches all of the elements of claim 6.

Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6. Claim 6 states that the electrical connector comprises a conductive latching arm having a front end fastened to an end portion of the shielding shell, and whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. Yeomans et al. teaches a latch assembly 18 having a T-shaped principal section 132 and front plate 136. The T-shaped principal section 132 has side flanges 134 that include holes 140 that are snapped over knobs 128 to secure the latch assembly 18 onto an upper shell 12. The front plate 136 has a leading section 138 including a hole 144 that receives a knob 146 projecting from a front face 124 of an upper shell 12. The front face 124 further includes pins 148 in a U-shaped recess 150 that receives a lower lip portion 152 of the leading section 138 of the latch assembly 18. During assembly, the latch assembly 18 is mounted upon the upper shell 12 by positioning the knob 146 in the hole 144 and the lower lip 152 in the U-shaped recess 150. The side flanges 134 are snapped downward over sides 122 until the holes 140 receive the knobs 128. Because both ends of the latching arm 18 are fixed to respective shells 12, 14, Yeomans et al. does not teach a latching arm having a rear end that can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. Yeomans et al., therefore, does not teach all of the elements of claim 6. Removal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 6. As previously discussed, Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6. Specifically, Yeomans et al. does not teach a conductive latching arm having a front end fastened to an end portion of the shielding shell, and

whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. Because Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6, Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 7. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

5. The Examiner has rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeomans et al. (US Patent No. 6,431,887 B1) in view of Hirai (US Patent No. 5,634,809).

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner stated that Yeomans et al. teaches all of the elements of claim 8, except the engaging part of the latching arm having an engaging hole that is formed in a forward-facing surface of the latching arm. The Examiner further stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the engaging part of the latching arm with a hole for engaging with a projection of a mating shell since the modification is old and well known. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that the combination of Yeomans et al. in view of Hirai teaches or suggests all of the elements of claim 8.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 6. As previously discussed, Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6, except an engaging part of the latching arm having an engaging hole that is formed in a forward-facing surface of the latching arm. Specifically, Yeomans et al. fails to teach a conductive latching arm having a front end fastened to an end portion of the shielding shell, and whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. Because Yeomans et al. does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 8, except the engaging part of the latching arm having an engaging hole that is formed in a forward-facing surface of the latching arm, the combination of Yeomans et al. in view of Hirai does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 8. Because the Examiner has

failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, removal of the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner has failed to set forth an argument stating the reasons why claim 9 is unpatentable over Yeomans et al. in view of Hirai. However, the Applicant notes that claim 9 depends from independent claim 6. As previously discussed, Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6. Specifically, Yeomans et al. does not teach a conductive latching arm having a front end fastened to an end portion of the shielding shell, and whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. The combination of Yeomans et al. in view of Hirai, therefore, does not teach all of the elements of claim 9. Because the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, removal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner stated that Yeomans et al. teaches all of the elements of claim 10, except the shielding shell being enclosed with a covering enclosure. The Examiner further stated that Hirai teaches a covering enclosure 9 used to enclose a shielding shell 8a, 8b. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that it would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Yeomans et al. by providing the shielding shell with a covering enclosure as taught by Hirai in order to protect the shielding shell of the connector.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 6. As previously discussed, Yeomans et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 6, except the shielding shell being enclosed with a covering enclosure. Specifically, Yeomans et al. does not teach a conductive latching arm having a front end fastened to an end portion of the shielding shell, and whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide on a surface of the shielding shell. Because Yeomans et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 10, except the shielding shell being enclosed with a

covering enclosure, the combination of Yeomans et al. in view of Hirai does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 10. Because the Examiner has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness, removal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

6. The specification has been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectively requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroshi Shirai, Applicant

Jennifer M. Slonaker
Registration No. 50568
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: 717.399.1535
Facsimile: 717.291.4660

Version with Markings to Show Changes

In the Specification:

Replace the paragraph on page 1, lines 16-26 with the following:

Conventionally, in order to improve noise resistance in high-speed signal transmission, shielding members are generally provided on housings in which [the] signal contacts are provided, as is shown in Japanese Utility Model Registration No. 2542233. [The] E[e]lectrical contact terminals are positioned inside a socket housing to form a socket connector. This connector is constructed so that this socket connector and another plug connector of similar construction are engaged and locked to each other by means of a locking part. The locking part is disposed in a location that is separated from the shielding shell.

In the Claims:

Delete claims 1-5.